REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Official Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 remain pending in the application, with Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10 being independent. Claims 1-3 and 5-11 have been amended herein.

Claims 1, 7, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0207674 (Otsuki). Claims 2, 4, 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Otsuki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,527,360 (Otsuki et al.). Claim 3 was rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Otsuki in view of Otsuki et al. and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0063871 (Kinas). Claim 5 was rejected was rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Otsuki in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0196298 (Cheng et al.). Claim 6 was rejected was rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Otsuki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,604,806 (Yamada et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Otsuki is directed to adjustment of misalignment of recording positions during bi-directional printing. As understood by Applicant, different position adjustment values are selectively used to perform printing according to different bi-directional printing modes. Otsuki does not disclose or suggest at least that on the basis of a plurality of

- 17 -

landing position adjustment values set in association with a plurality of areas in a conveying direction of the print medium, controlling the operation of ejecting ink droplets in each area, with the landing position adjustment values determined on the basis of test patterns, as is recited in independent Claims 1, 5 and 7.

Nor does Otsuki disclose or suggest that before a trailing edge passes through conveying means, an ink ejecting operation is performed on the basis of a first landing position adjustment value and after a trailing edge passes through the conveying means or rollers, on the basis of a second landing position adjustment value, with the landing position adjustment values being determined on the basis of test patterns, as is recited in independent Claims 2 and 3.

Otsuki also does not disclose or suggest that an operation performed by a print head to eject ink droplets in a main scanning direction is controlled on the basis of landing position adjustment values, with the landing position adjustment values being acquired in accordance with printing density in the conveying direction of the print medium, as is recited in independent Claim 6.

Further, Otsuki does not disclose or suggest adjusting ink ejection timing using an adjustment value corresponding to a position of the printing medium and controlling so that the adjustment value is used to adjust the ink ejection timing out of a plurality of adjustment values corresponding to positions of the printing medium, as is recited in independent Claim 8.

Also, Otsuki does not disclose or suggest adjusting ink ejecting timing in forward scanning and backward scanning of a print head according to a first adjustment value when the printing medium is in a first position, and adjusting ejection timings in forward scanning and backward scanning according to a second adjusting value different from the first adjusting value when the printing medium is in a second position downstream of the first position, as is recited in independent Claim 10.

Thus, Otsuki fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in the independent claims.

Otsuki et al. is directed to a printer that accurately positions image data on printing paper. Applicant submits that Otsuki et al. detects the edge of the sheet accurately using a sensor mounted on a carriage. While the image formed on the sheet is positionally adjusted, Otsuki et al. does not teach that printing for different areas is controlled based on a plurality of registration values. Otsuki et al. is not believed to remedy the deficiencies of Otsuki noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Kinas is directed to a line feed calibration method in a printer and can identify media advancement errors utilizing plural test patterns. Kinas also fails to remedy the deficiencies of the citations noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Cheng et al. describes controlling ink ejection frequency to compensate for recording medium unevenness due to cockling, for example. Cheng et al., however, also does not disclose or suggest the features noted above as being deficient in Otsuki.

Yamada et al. describes high resolution printing based on low resolution print data transferred from a host computer. However, Yamada et al. also fails to remedy the deficiencies of the citations noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10 are patentable over the citations of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10. Dependent Claims 4, 9 and 11 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in the independent claims. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark A. Williamson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

MAW/agm

DC_MAIN 234254v1